UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,893	09/19/2000	John Michael Everson	30604	5121

33272	7590	04/11/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-22100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/664,893	EVERSON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Pramila Parthasarathy	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 21-26* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 21-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to remarks and amendments filed on January 14,

2005. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 11 and 12. Claims 13 – 20 were cancelled

and Claims 21 – 26 were added. Therefore, presently pending Claims are 1 – 12 and 21

– 26.

2.   Examiner initiated telephone discussion on April 04, 2005 with Mark L. Mollon

resulted in amending Claim 24 to depend on Claim 7 and Claims 25 and 26 to depend

on Claim 24.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed on January 14, 2005, have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claims 1 – 12 and 21 - 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended independent and new Claims 1 and 7 recite, " ... a directory server

coupled with the authorization server, ...", and dependent Claims 11, 21 and 24 recite "

... the directory server ...".

With respect to "a directory server", although the specification discloses a

directory to store dynamic information such as session information and that the directory

is coupled with the authorization server and the user profile databases via the

communication network, the specification does not disclose a directory server where a

directory is stored or a directory server coupled with the authorization server.

Furthermore, the specification does not indicate how a directory server is used to

authenticate or authorize the user data and the specification does not disclose how a

directory server is used for creating a shopping cart or the directory server being

operable for allowing the user to select items to be purchased, how the other computer

applications access the object on the directory server.

Applicant remarks/arguments address "a directory on a directory server", "the

directory server permits ...", and "the ability of additional applications access the object

for the computer user on the directory server ...". Applicant remarks/arguments does

not provide any support or direct wherein specification such disclosure is made.

The dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 10, 12, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected at least

by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims.

5.   Regarding currently amended independent Claims 1 and 7, Applicant argues that

Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereafter "Alegre") do not teach "an object

associated with the Session ID is stored dynamically in a directory in a directory server

coupled with the authorization server", "the directory server permits other computer

applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's

computer" and "the other applications access the object for the computer user on the

directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer

applications". These arguments are not found persuasive.

       Alegre discloses that an object associated with the Session ID (cookie with the

session key) is stored dynamically in a directory in a directory server coupled with the

authentication server (Alegre Column 5 line 8 – Column 6 line 22), wherein object

(cookie) consists of a Session ID (session key) that is stored in the directory;

       the directory server permits other computer applications launched by the

computer user to reference the Session ID on the user computer (Alegre Column 5 line

48 – Column 6 line 49), and the other applications access the object for the computer

user on the directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer

applications (Column 6 lines 6 – 68), wherein the server determines the validity of the

Session ID before permitting accessing the resources and the accessing requests that

may include one or more requests for operations by resources (other applications)

(Alegre Column 8 lines 16 – 27).

6.   Regarding independent Claims 4 and 10, Applicant argues that the Alegre do not

teach, "the Session ID is based on a date on which the computer user launched the

computer application, a time in which the computer user launched the computer

application, a TCP/IP address of the computer user, or a user name of the computer

user". This argument is not found persuasive.

Alegre discloses that the Session ID (Session key) is based on user

authentication information such as user ID (UID) and password ID (PWD), expiration

criteria (Column 3 lines 1 – 11, Column 5 lines 8 – 36 and Column 6 lines 24 – 68).

7.   Regarding claims 5, 6, 11 and 12, Applicant argues that the Hartman fails to

correct for the deficiencies in Alegre. Alegre discloses the limitations of Claim 1 and 7

as discussed above and Hartman discloses a shopping cart and storing the shopping

cart along with the object (e.g. unique identifier, Session key, UID, PWD, expiration

criteria, etc.) and other user-specific information (Harman Column 3 line 31 – Column 4

lines 46).

8.   Regarding newly added Claims 21 – 26, Applicant argues that "dynamic

directory services used by the other applications to access the object stored in the

directory server" is neither suggested nor shown by any cited references. This

argument is not found persuasive as Alegre discloses dynamic directory services used

by the other applications to access the object stored in the directory server as discussed

above.

9.   Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior art does teach or

suggest the amended subject matter " a directory in a directory server" broadly recited

in the amended independent claims 1 and 7. The dependent claims 2 – 6, 8 – 12 and 21

- 26 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims and by

other reason set forth in this office action. Accordingly, the rejection for the pending

claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 26 is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10.   Claims 1 – 4, 7 –10, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113).

11.   Regarding Claim 1, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically

tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 –

13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the method comprising the

steps of:

storing security information for a plurality of computer users in a user profile

database (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

receiving at an authorization server coupled with the user profile database log-

in information from the computer user who has launched a computer application

(Column 4 lines 8 – 40);

in response to step b, creating a Session ID for the computer user with the

authorization server (Column 4 lines 8 – 40 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42);

storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer (Column 4

lines 8 – 42);

also in response to step b, creating an object associated with the computer user

or the Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42 and Column 5 lines 8 – 20);

storing the object dynamically in a directory stored in a directory server coupled

with the authorization server (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49);

copying at least some of the security information relating to the computer user

from the user profile database to the object in the directory (Column 6 lines 24 – 67);

comparing the log-in information entered by the computer user to the security

information for the computer .user and allowing the computer user access to the

launched computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized user of the

computer application (Column 6 lines 24 – 49); and

permitting other computer applications launched by the computer user to

reference the Session ID on the user's computer (Column 6 lines 6 – 68); and

the other computer applications accessing the object for the computer user on

the directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer

applications (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49).

12.   Regarding Claim 7, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically

tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 –

13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the system comprising:

a user profile database for storing security information for a plurality of computer

users (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

an authorization server coupled with the user profile database for receiving log-in

information from a computer user who has launched a computer application, for creating

a Session ID for the computer user, for storing at least a portion of the Session ID on

the user's computer and for creating an object associated with the computer user or the

Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42; Column 5 lines 8 – 20 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42);

and

a directory stored in a directory server coupled with the authorization server for

dynamically storing the object created by the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 –

34),

the authorization server being further operable for copying at least some of the

security information relating to the computer user from the user profile database to the

object in the directory, comparing log-in information entered by the computer user to the

security information for the computer user and allowing the computer user access to the

launched computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized user of the

computer application (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49),

the directory server permitting other computer applications launched by the

computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's computer so that the other

computer applications may access the object for the computer user on the directory

server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer applications without

requiring the user to re-enter the log-in information (Column 6 lines 6 – 67).

13.   Claims 2 and 8 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the security information including

authentication and authorization information (Column 4 lines 48 – 67 and Column 7

lines 55 – Column 8 line 20).

14.   Claims 4 and 10 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the Session ID being based on at least one of

the following: a date on which the computer user launched the computer application; a

time in which the computer user launched the computer application; a TCP/IP address

of the computer user; and a user name of the computer user (Column 3 lines 1 – 11,

Column 5 lines 8 – 36 and Column 6 lines 24 – 68).

15.   Claims 3 and 9 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 2 and 8.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the authentication and authorization

information including at least one of the following: user names, user IDs, passwords,

public-key data, certificates, and access control information (Column 5 line 8 – Column

6 line 65).

16.   Claims 21 and 24 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), wherein the other computer applications

access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service (Column 5

line 48 – Column 6 line 49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17.   Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereinafter "Alegre") in

view of Hartman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,960,411 hereinafter "Hartman").

18.   Claims 5 and 11 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the steps of creating a

shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory (Alegre

Column 8 lines 28 – 44). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the method for

dynamically tracking a user session includes the steps of creating a shopping cart and

storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory. However, Hartman

discloses a method for creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with

a unique client identifier (cookie), purchaser-specific information (Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 6 line 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hartman's shopping cart system into the dynamically tracking user session system of Alegre.

Alegre could have been modified by Hartman to arrive the claimed invention by having the shopping cart with user purchase information to be saved on the directory as taught by Hartman (See Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 8 line 25) and as suggested by Alegre (See Alegre Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 53). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Alegre by Hartman as discussed above because in a shopping cart systems user profiles are stored in a directory as taught by Hartman and employing the shopping cart within Alegre would provide an efficient and secure method for dynamically tracking a user session.

19.   Claims 6 and 12 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 5 and 11. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the steps of allowing the user to select items to be purchased and storing information relating to the selected items in the shopping cart (Hartman Column 3 line 46 – Column 4 line 26; Column 5 line 27 – Column 6 line 21 and Column 7 line 57 – Column 8 line 25).

20. Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereafter "Alegre") in

view of Blanco et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,539,482, hereafter "Blanco").

21. Claims 22 and 25 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 21 and 24.

Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user

session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), wherein the other computer applications

access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service (Column 5

line 48 – Column 6 line 49). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the dynamic

directory service comprises the lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP). However,

Blanco discloses a network access authentication system that gathers the data

concerning the users, including authentication data, in a data base of a directory, which

uses Light weight directory access protocol which is specifically targeted at

management applications and browsing applications that provide interactive access to

directories (Blanco Column 3 lines 22 – 67).

22. Motivation to combine Blanco with Alegre comes from the need to provide

authentication and authorization of a user available to an authorization server coupled

with a directory server that stores the authentication (user) data. Alegre provides a

discussion of the need for security and authorization information for all the resources

that a user can access but is silent as to the specific details of the LDAP, see Alegre

Column 1 line 51 – Column 2 line 35 (especially Column 2 lines 24 – 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Alegre with Blanco because LDAP provides the authentication data stored in the directory available to all the applications that are associated with a directory server and provides interactive access to directories.

23.   Claims 23 and 26 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 21 and 24. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), wherein the other computer applications access the object on the directory server using a dynamic directory service (Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the dynamic directory service comprises the X.500 access protocol. However, Blanco discloses a network access authentication system that gathers the data concerning the users, including authentication data, in a data base of a directory, which uses Light weight directory access protocol that supports X.500 access protocol (Blanco Column 3 lines 22 – 67).

24.   Motivation to combine Blanco with Alegre comes from the need to provide authentication and authorization of a user available to an authorization server coupled with a directory server that stores the authentication (user) data. Alegre provides a discussion of the need for security and authorization information for all the resources

that a user can access but is silent as to the specific details of the LDAP, see Alegre

Column 1 line 51 – Column 2 line 35 (especially Column 2 lines 24 – 35). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Alegre with Blanco because

LDAP which supports X.500 access protocol, provides the authentication data stored in

the directory available to all the applications that are associated with a directory server

and provides interactive access to directories.

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

26.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

27.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-

272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m.. If attempts

to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz

Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to

the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose

telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY C

Pramila Parthasarathy

April 04, 2005.